

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

Thursday, February 27, 2020

6:00 p.m.

**Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Room
2277 East Bengal Boulevard
Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

Members Present: Chair Scott Peters, Adam Breen, Scott Chapman, Scott Henriksen

Staff Present: Community Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, City Planner Andrew Hulka, Deputy City Recorder Heather Sundquist

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Scott Peters called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.

Chair Peters welcomed those present and specifically New Planning Commission Member Adam Breen.

1.1 Ex-Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.

There were no ex-parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

2.0 Discussion Items

2.1 (Project CUP-19-005) Action on a Request by Allied Electric Sign for Approval of a Revised Certificate of Design Compliance for New Signs at 7269 South Union Park Avenue.

Chair Peters reminded the Commission of discussions from a prior meeting about processes regarding minor revisions or submittals. At that time it was proposed that minor revisions be reviewed by the Chair rather than the entire Commission. If the Chair deemed it minor, he could approve it on their own. Chair Peters noted that the above discussion item is one he would have approved if this was the process. The applicant was present to describe the request. Chair Peters invited Commission feedback on whether this would be the type of minor issue that would be appropriate for sole Chair approval.

City Planner, Andrew Hulka reported that the Commission previously reviewed the matter and was provided with a Certificate of Design Compliance for 7269 South Union Park Avenue. The request is for the new Winger's building on the corner of Union Park Avenue and Creek Road. Images of the approved wall and canopy signs were displayed. It was reported that the original approval specified that any additional signage would require ARC approval. The City received a sign permit for new signs. One is a directional sign on the southwest corner of the property at the

entrance from Union Park Avenue. It is three square feet in size and meets the size requirements in the Code for directional signs.

The other sign that was not previously reviewed was the monument sign on the opposite side of the entry and exit off of Union Park Avenue. The monument sign was proposed. While Winger's had a pole sign, pole signs are prohibited in the current sign ordinance. Since the applicant is not able to do a pole sign, they have proposed a monument sign that is approximately 90 square feet in size. As the maximum size of a monument sign in the Regional Commercial Zone is 96 square feet, it was determined that the proposed sign meets the requirements. The application specified that the bricks on the monument sign will match the bricks used on the building. Staff required that the matching of bricks take place.

Mr. Hulka provided context for the area and stated that a large sign like this would not appear out of place. Staff's recommendation was to approve the sign with the condition that the brick veneer base on the monument sign matches the brick used on the building. A representative from the sign company was in attendance.

Commissioner Breen moved to issue a Revised Certificate of Design Compliance for Project CUP-19-005. Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Commission unanimously agreed this was the sort of minor issue that could be approved at the sole discretion of the Chair.

2.2 (Project SPL-20-001) Action on a Request by Kevin Gates (CW Management) for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a New Restaurant at 7237 South Canyon Centre Parkway.

Mr. Hulka presented information on the proposed development and explained that different entities, including the ARC, met to review the different aspects of the project. Two of the parcels in the proposed development are intended for use as a restaurant and a retail shop, respectively. Mr. Hulka noted that while the site plan has been previously approved and the proposed uses have been previously contemplated, specific designs had not been presented previously. They were being presented now for review by the Commission.

Mr. Hulka provided context on the surrounding area. There is a hotel to the south and the Dugala Distillery to the north. The Distillery is under construction and has been before the Commission for approval several times. SAOLA restaurant is now open and is part of the development on the west side. There are additional businesses along Fort Union Boulevard as well. Mr. Hulka displayed photos of the site. He presented the proposed site plan and used pointed out that what is labeled as Unit 2D is proposed as a second restaurant that would be attached to the restaurant that is currently under construction. The area labeled as Unit 2E is a retail pad connected to the parking garage. This will form a walkway/alleyway between the hotel and the restaurant buildings. Mr. Hulka noted that this was something the City wants feedback on from the ARC tonight.

The parking plan was another issue the Commission would be examining. The applicant is proposing an alternative parking plan. Mr. Hulka explained that parking requirements are calculated by the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Parking Generation Handbook. It generates parking requirements based on single-use buildings and uses the most intense average parking demand for that use type. In this case, a restaurant requires 16.41 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Using the square footage proposed with the restaurant and retail space, the requirement would typically be 50 parking spaces.

The applicant was proposing that the restaurant use a ratio of 10 stalls per 1,000 square feet. That would result in 21 spaces for the restaurant and 15 for the retail, which would fit within the 36 parking spaces agreed to in the Shared Parking Agreement. Staff recommended approving the Alternative Parking Plan because they are not single-use spaces. The development is shared use and there is an opportunity for parking to be shared between all of the uses. Mr. Hulka stated that there are close to 500 total spaces in the new development.

It was reported that when the Dugala Distillery was approved, it was accomplished by using a previous generation of the ITE handbook. The parking requirement use for the restaurant was about 10 stalls per 1,000 square feet. In the new manual, the strictest requirement increased but the City used 10 stalls per 1,000 on this site previously.

Mr. Hulka reported that staff was comfortable that the parking meets the previous standards, though today it is short by 14 stalls from what is required. The ARC has the authority to grant the change.

The Commission moved to a discussion of the walkway area. Staff recommended proposing landscaping and lighting for the area. The recommendation was not specific and the ARC was left delve into specifics. Though it was not in the original packet that was emailed to the members of the Commission, the City had since received a landscaping plan from the developer.

The applicant, Chris Jensen was asked how the exterior walls that part of the restaurant near the plaza area will be treated. Mr. Jensen responded that they are planning to bring the siding around to the point where the new building will start. There is coordination between the parties so that one knows when to stop the siding and the other knows when to pick it up so there is not a gap.

Concerning the Lighting Plan for the courtyard, Mr. Jensen stated that it was difficult to develop a cohesive plan for the entire development, although the necessary parties would be meeting later in the day to develop a consistent Lighting Plan as a central element that will blend the entire site. The Commission expressed their approval and commended Mr. Jensen for his efforts. It was acknowledged that this is a challenging space to utilize.

There were two separate applications before the Commission that required two separate motions.

Commissioner Henriksen moved to issue a Revised Certificate of Design Compliance for projects SPL-20-001 on the condition that a cohesive landscape and lighting plan be submitted. Commissioner Breen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

2.3 (Project SPL-20-002) Action on a Request by Kevin Gates (CW Management) for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a New Retail Shop at 7333 South Canyon Centre Parkway.

This issue was discussed in conjunction with Project SPL 20-002.

Commissioner Henriksen moved to issue a Revised Certificate of Design Compliance for the above project with the condition that the finish materials of the adjoining restaurant match what is already in existence and that a cohesive Lighting and Landscape Plan be submitted. Commissioner Breen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

2.4 (Project PDD-19-001) A Recommendation to the Planning Commission on a Request by Wasatch Rock, LLC for a Proposed Planned Development District Preliminary Plan and Rezone Application for the Redevelopment of approximately 21.7 Acres at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard.

Community Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson presented the staff report and state that the application has been under review for a few months. It has not yet been reviewed by the Planning Commission in a formal hearing. Those involved are still working out a few significant issues. The desire was to have the project reviewed by the ARC with the applicant present to provide details and the layout of the overall proposal. Mr. Johnson reported that the site is approximately 20 acres in size and comprises the far end of the gravel pit property. The property is currently zoned Foothill Residential. It was never the intent for the property to be developed as Foothill Residential. The original plan was envisioned to include denser development. The Planned Development District Ordinance was created to guide redevelopment in certain areas of the City and allows a hybrid rezoning process. It includes an overall site plan and details on what is being proposed. What is before the Commission was a legislative application that will ultimately be decided on by the City Council.

Mr. Johnson displayed a graphic taken from the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan that was adopted last year. For the gravel pit, the Master Plan envisions the area being walkable and urban. The hope was that there are recreational amenities incorporated into the development. Mr. Johnson stated that a major part of the vision for the area is that it has transit-supportive amenities. The City has worked closely with UDOT on the site to explore the possibility of a transit hub to reduce traffic in the canyons.

Mr. Johnson reviewed key concepts envisioned for the site. They include connected street networks, mixed types of development, outdoor recreational amenities, and a local access road. The emphasis would be on creating a pedestrian-friendly, walkable development. The aesthetic of the buildings should be compatible with the surrounding natural environment. It was noted that there will also be a tie into the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

Mr. Johnson presented the site plan to the Commission but indicated that the applicant has an updated version. It is proposed that there be a mix of buildings and uses. The original site plan

contemplated one large office building, however, that was broken down into two smaller buildings. The east side of the access road was dedicated to residential development. It includes apartments for renters, condominiums for owners, and a senior living center. The tallest building proposed on the site was for condominiums and includes five levels of parking with 10 levels of housing above.

Mr. Johnson presented a constraint map to the Commission and explained that the site has many constraints in terms of what can realistically be built. There is a metropolitan water aqueduct and a buffer area that cannot be built on. There are faults and fault setback areas that do not allow for building. There is a very steep hillside that is unbuildable as well. There are significant limitations, but Mr. Johnson expressed confidence that the applicant is doing good work within those constraints to give the site a cohesive feel. The purpose of this meeting was for the ARC to provide thoughtful feedback to the applicant with common design standards that can be incorporated into the eventual ordinance. Mr. Johnson emphasized that this will be a multi-phase project that will be developed over several years. The hope was to guide the development so that it is cohesive.

Mr. Johnson displayed photos from the applicant demonstrating the future design concepts for the site. They are still at a preliminary level and can change depending on input from the ARC.

In response to a question raised regarding parking, Mr. Johnson explained that the applicants have complied with the parking requirements and there is a significant amount of structural parking available as well. The Commission wished to see a cohesive, walkable space as opposed to different pads being placed near each other.

Adam Davis from Rockwork Companies and Jordan Walker from Beecher Walker introduced themselves. Mr. Davis described the constraints that exist on the site and how the applicants have worked to come up with the best plan that can work within those constraints. He commented on the unfortunate circumstance of the aqueduct and highlighted the fact that there are manmade constraints to work through as well as natural ones.

The possibility of changing the location of the office building was discussed to ensure that the view is preserved. Mr. Davis explained that the decision was made to trade one large office building for two smaller ones. He reported that a few corporations have shown interest in locating their corporate headquarters on the site.

Mr. Davis presented a site plan to the Commission and emphasized the desire for a plan that is walkable and pedestrian-friendly. He highlighted the area between the two office buildings. The intent was for it to be a plaza area that contains pockets and nodes to drive activity outside and create a mixed-use experience.

Mr. Davis acknowledged weaknesses in the original site plan and was open to feedback on ways to make the site cohesive and walkable. The plan now consists of two smaller office buildings. The orientation of the hotel was flipped to make it more part of the central plan. They also reduced parking on the southwest side. They attempted to create a plan so that passersby on Wasatch Boulevard do not see cars and instead will see over the parking structure. Design had not been a priority in this part of the planning process.

A question was raised as to whether staff sees this phase as a first step in a plan that will have continuity with the surrounding area or will be stand-alone piece. It was confirmed this is to be part of an overall plan with a roadway providing continuity in between.

Ways of promoting connectivity in the plan were highlighted. It was noted that the orientation of the hotel was flipped and some parking was removed to make areas more prominent and provide outdoor seating. The public plaza between the two mixed-used buildings will draw people outside into an urban park environment. All of this will be activated through restaurants with outdoor seating and retail stores. It will become a more natural environment with a pedestrian and bicycle trail drawing people through the area.

Commission Members commented on these efforts and praised what has been done well by the applicant. It was emphasized that connectivity is important as well as the potential for green corridors to draw people together in a more cohesive way. There was concern expressed about the amount of concrete around buildings. Some members of the Commission expressed a desire to create as much green space as possible on the site. It was mentioned that the proposed development should attract outside visitors and be walkable.

It was noted that the site plan has been the priority and the architecture and design were planned to follow the formation of a solid site plan. Concern was expressed about the lack of design details. It was mentioned that without solid tenants for the project, it is unclear what the architects should be designing. There was reluctance to spend money and time to draw up detailed designs that may not be used. The Commission and those present agreed they would like to have detailed guidelines for this part of the project and others so that it is cohesive. There was a desire to bring a mountain feel to the project using materials such as stone, glass, and metals. Those present agreed that pictures are most helpful in developing guidelines.

It was mentioned several times that the proposed development will define Cottonwood Heights as a city and, therefore, needs to be done perfectly.

The ARC was not prepared to make any sort of decision tonight with the understanding that eventually a Certificate of Design Compliance will need to be issued. In this case, the Commission was also being asked to make recommendations on design guidelines and standards.

Staff's intent was for the project to have already been approved by the ARC when it is reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Chapman moved to continue Project PDD-9-001 to the next meeting. Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3.0 Consent Agenda

3.1 Approval of Minutes of February 27, 2020.

Commissioner Breen moved to approve the minutes of February 27, 2020, after the following process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Chapman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

4.0 Adjournment

Commissioner Henriksen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Chapman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights Architectural Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, February 27, 2020.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: March 5, 2020